R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 014 951 JC 670 225

FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIPS--WHY THE CONFLICT.

BY- EPLER, STEPHEN M.

PUB DATE 10 DEC 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$1.16 27P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *TEACHER ADMINISTRATOR RELATIONSHIP, *COLLEGE FACULTY, *CONFLICT, ADMINISTRATOR ROLE, TEACHER ROLE, DECISION MAKING, POLICY FORMATION, GOVERNANCE, *COLLEGE ADMINISTRATION, FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS,

EVIDENCE OF CONFLICT IS SEEN IN THE GROWING NUMBER OF FACULTY ORGANIZATIONS AND IN THEIR GROWTH OF ACTIVISM AND THEIR CHANGE IN EMPHASIS. IN THE TRANSITION OF THE JUNIOR COLLEGE FROM A PUBLIC SCHOOL TO A HIGHER EDUCATION STATUS, SOME CONFLICT IS EXPECTED. ADMINISTRATOR-PERCEIVED STEREOTYPES OF FACULTY AND FACULTY-PERCEIVED STEREOTYPES OF ADMINISTRATORS ARE REINFORCED BY SPECIFIC INCIDENTS AND TEND TO AGGRAVATE CONFLICT. COMMITTED TO A DISCIPLINE, THE FACULTY MEMBER DOES NOT NECESSARILY SHARE THE ADMINISTRATOR'S INSTITUTIONAL ORIENTATION. LACK OF ADEQUATE DATA AND INFORMATION TENDS TO DIRECT ATTENTION FROM EDUCATIONAL OR INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES TO THOSE OF PERSONALITIES. COMMUNICATION PROBLEMS ARE ACCENTUATED BY DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTION OF THE AMOUNT OF FACULTY PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING AND POLICY FORMATION, AS WELL AS BY DIFFERENCES IN ROLE EXPECTATIONS. SOME ADMINISTRATOR-FACULTY CONFLICT IS NATURAL, EVEN AMONG THE MOST ADEPT ADMINISTRATORS AND MOST FAIR-MINDED FACULTY. EFFORTS SHOULD BE CONCENTRATED ON PREVENTING AGGRAVATED CONFLICT AND ON MODULATING NATURAL CONFLICT. (WO)

ERIC

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

ED014951

FACULTY-ADMINISTRATION RELATIONSHIPS--WHY THE CONFLICT?

December 10, 1966

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 29 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

Stephen M. Epler

Education 261D: Dr. Fred Kintzer

JC 670 225

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION..... 2

HYPOTHESES..... 3

Stereotyping..... 3

Faculty Stereotypes of Administration..... 3

Administrator Stereotypes of Faculty..... 6

Changing Status of the Junior College..... 7

Loss of Identity.....10

Faculty Conservatism.....11

"Universal" versus "Particular" Orientation.....11

Poor Administration.....13

Lack of Data.....15

Goals and Objectives.....16

Communication.....17

Role Expectations.....19

CONCLUSION.....20

The Dynamics of Conflict.....20

The Nature of "Differences".....21

Concluding Statement.....21

Figure 1: Nature of the Difference.....22

Figure 2: Reasons for the Difference.....23

BIBLIOGRAPHY.....25

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of California Junior College Faculty Association, Academic Senates, the American Federation of Teachers and the "new" CTA reflects the growing agressiveness of junior college faculties. A variety of factors, some new, some old, some chronic, some transient produce this emergence. Growing militancy among junior college teachers is only one explanation of faculty-administration conflict. Many other explanations exist; conflict is the subject of this paper. More specifically, why the conflict?

Many explanations for this conflict exist. Administrators blame paranoid teachers. Faculty blame authoritarian administrators. Communication problems reinforce prejudice. Differences over the purposes of education, the role and status of the junior college, and the function of administration tend to compound the problem. This paper will attempt to analyze and describe some of the more salient causes of conflict. Then it will try to integrate the causes into a coherent pattern.

Before embarking, however, on the good ship "Research" into the troubled sea of "Conflict," it may be well to ask why make the journey in the first place. Conflict is an integral part of administration. Rather than be overwhelmed by it, rather than be blinded by it, one should seek comprehension. Then the administrator can better cope with conflict and try to make the best of it. Then he can retain the objectivity to analyze significant problem-areas, rather than write off conflict as the work of "outside agitators" and academic "reds." Then he can perhaps postpone the day when he will be completely consumed by ulcers.

HYPOTHESES

Stereotyping

Stereotypes are "preconceived notions as to how people of a given race, nationality, occupation, or position ought to appear or behave. . .Although many of these ideas have little or no basis in fact, they constantly influence our observations of peoples' behavior or appearance."[1] Stereotyping is a tool in structuring one's universe. Once the stereotype is formed, the individual can adjust to most circumstances, for experiences either corroborate the experience or are "refenced," compartmentalized to fit the prejudice. Administrators are "dictatorial." Thus, kindly administrators are "refenced," treated as exceptions and catagorized in a different area--"He must have had a liberal education," or "he must be an English major." But a high-handed action, either real or imagined, reinforces the prejudice and provides another anecdote to relate to like-minded friends. Conversely, teachers are "arrogant." This stereotype is constantly being reinforced, for administrators tend to see faculty who are either angry or requesting something; the ninty-five percent which administrators rarely see are either forgotten or "refenced."

Faculty Stereotypes of Administrators: "There are in our (colleges) able professors and otherwise loveable souls to whom the very sight of a (college) president seems to be like. . .the waving of a red flag to an enraged beast."[2]

---

1. Floyd L. Ruch, Psychology and Life (Scott, Foresman: Chicago) 1958, p. 76.

2. Harold W. Dobbs, The Academic President: Educator or Caretaker? (McGraw-Hill: New York) 1962, p. 5.

This quotation illustrates the influence of stereotypes on human behavior. It surely is a powerful force that transforms a loveable and able professor into an enraged beast! Why such rage? A complex of attitudes that underlies the faculty stereotype reveals a black portrait of the administrator: he is crass, unimaginative, unscholarly, conservative, conventional, authoritarian, inflexible, philistine, and dull-witted. He is a paper-shuffler; he threatens "academic freedom;" he is a lackey of a businessman board; he is a P.E. major.[3]

The administrator, according to stereotype, is the product of two factors: limited mentality and narrow experience. He is not bright. He either washed out of an academic field and turned to micky mouse education, or he had a poor record in football and was "fired" upwards to administration. Now this man of limited capacity and conventional attitudes undergoes a process that reduces his range of vision even more; he takes education courses. These instill anti-democratic, anti-intellectual, "run-a-tight-ship" attitudes; then he takes a position in a secondary school which reinforces his authoritarianism. He is now prepared to become a junior college president.

Trouble begins as soon as the high-school-minded administrator crosses the legitimate aims and aspirations of the college faculty. He fears articulate, courageous faculty, defending the academic right of participation. His businessman mentality inhibits sympathy with this viewpoint, and he falls back to rigid negativism and upon restricting policy. Without the support

---

3. Many of these attitudes were expressed during interviews and conversations with faculty members at several junior colleges.

of legal and formal power, the administrator would be helpless, for he has little else to recommend him; he is intellectually dull,[4] and probably an incompetent teacher, (no doubt he hated teaching else why leave it?) But he is secure from genuine competition with competence, for credentialing requirements, with their emphasis on stulifying education courses, deter bright men, (a Conant or a Hutchins could not be a junior college president, it is said.) Yes, (and this really galls the faculty, adding many reinforcements to their stereotype) this dim-witted autocrat makes twice the salary of the highest paid teacher; he is the most prestigious man on campus.

The stereotype of the administrator is supplemented by stereotyping his position. Faculty assume much administration is unnecessary and should be limited to routine bookkeeping chores. It must be parasitic, for parochial schools do without much administrative overhead, English Universities are ably governed by the faculty, and the earliest universities fared well without administrators.

Like most stereotypes, that of the administrator has some basis in fact, for without reinforcing experiences it would soon become extinguished. If some faculty-administration conflict is natural, some experiences will support the stereotype. Unfortunately, other facets of the stereotype may be true, for many junior college administrators do have a P.E., secondary education background. Many are authoritarian and defensive. Many are anti-intellectual. Meanwhile, wise administration decisions go unrecognized and uncelegrated. The faculty takes

---

4. Dobbs, The Academic President, p. 68: "A dean is to stupid to be a professor, but to bright to be a president." old faculty proverb.

for granted their paycheck, roll book, small class, film projector, parking space, clean office, pleasant classroom, lack of community kooks, properly counseled students, etc.

One reality, however, accentuates the stereotype and disrupts faculty objectivity. Administrators do possess greater prestige in society. They also obtain a significantly greater salary. This grates faculty sensitivities. It appears to be an inversion of natural and true values, for administrators exist to serve teachers, who perform the primary function, not teachers to serve administrators. Since teaching is paramount, those who implement it obviously deserve the greatest renumeration.

Regardless of how real or illusory the stereotype may be, there is no denying that it plays an important role in faculty attitudes in dealing with administrators. For it is not reality that counts, but how people perceive it. Harold Leavitt, in describing a business situation, beautifully illustrates the problem of perception and authority.

> The perceived world is the world that determines behavior. Thus...an extremely insecure employee, with a distrustful set of attitudes toward superiors, may interpret <u>any</u> act by a superior as a threat, even if the superior is busy patting him on the head... The reason again is the dependency of the subordinate on the superior. No matter how nice Papa may be he is still Papa, and the bilet of authority around his middle <u>could</u> be used as a whip.[5]

<u>Administrator Stereotypes of Faculty:</u> Administrators, like faculty, have their stereotypes. The faculty member is not an admirable figure. He is "underlain with a deep sense

---

5. Harold J. Leavitt, <u>Managerial Psychology</u>, Second Edition, (University of Chicago Press: Chicago) 1964, p. 170.

of inferiority, fear and maladjustment, yet overlain by an almost frantic sense of superiority."[6] Harold Stoke provides another trait of these "bookish boys"--arrogance. "This," he claims, "grows out of the easy victories of the classroom where he works with young people who know less than he does. He may thus unconsciously come to believe that business, politics, and educational administration would be much better managed if those in charge would only apply the same intelligence to their work that he uses in his own..."[7]

Faculty resent any authority. They, as pimply-faced boys, hated their fathers, but projected this hatred onto less threatening figures. These latent paranoids compulsively acquire degrees and become faculty members; here they perceive administrators as father-surrogates and seek revenge. This accounts for the inevitable five percent of the faculty who are negative to the core, opposing any decision, regardless of its merits. Thus, faculty are insecure, arrogant, petty-minded, defensive, pedantic, negative, rigid, supercilious, bitter, driven, compulsive, radical, and reactionary.

The Changing Status of the Junior College

For many years, the junior college was a part of secondary education, the "thirteenth" and "fourteenth" grades. People believed the junior college to be a "glorified high school," a "high school with smoking." Now the junior college is assuming a role in higher education--the Master Plan for Higher Education

---

6. John J. Corson, Governance of Colleges and Universities, (McGraw-Hill: New York) 1960, p. 31.

7. Ibid.

reflected and accelerated this transition; the CCHE includes junior college representation. "As junior colleges shed the yoke of secondary education status...and (become) more closely allied with the universities...(the faculty) concluded that as college faculty members, their rights, privileges and responsibilities must be commensurate with their official membership in California's system of higher education."[8] In California, an outstanding University of California Senate, which is "generally regarded as the most powerful such institution in the country," provides an example which California junior college faculties seek to emulate.[9] Junior college instructors identify themselves as partners with the university and raise their expectations and standards to UC Senate levels. The instructors read newspaper articles describing the UC Senate's powerful role during the loyalty oath crisis, the FSM, the McCone Committee investigation (?), and in day-to-day policy formulation; they recall their own graduate student experiences and remember the comments of respected professors. This evolving identification with higher education institutions creates dissatisfaction. Sharma reports "teachers with the most academic preparation tended to be less satisfied than one of less preparation in regard to quality of professional leadership given by their superintendents."[10]

---

8. Bill Priest, "Faculty-Administrator Relationships," Junior College Journal, March 1964, p. 5.

9. Lynn Elly, "The University of California: Faculty Participation in the Government of the University," AAUP Bulletin, March 1964. p. 6.

10. Sharma, "Who Should Make What Decisions?" Administrators Notebook, April 1955.

This dissatisfaction undoubtedly results from the incongruence between present operation of junior colleges and expectation derived from university experience or identification.[11]

Thus, an important cause of faculty-administration conflict in the junior college lies in the process of transition from secondary to higher education status, for teachers seek the same prerogatives as their colleagues in established institutions of higher learning. The authoritarian, "dictatorial" tradition of secondary education clashes with the self-governing, "democratic" concept of higher education. "Forward," cry the standard-bearers of faculty prerogative, "on behalf of liberty and democracy."

Administrators, too, are affected by the changing status of the junior college. Administrators fondly remember the peaceful past when, presumably, teacher and administrator were personally close, members of a team. Those were the days when teachers would listen to reason, refusing to perceive authoritarian overtones in harmless memoranda. Administrators, assuming a concert of interest between faculty and administrator, are appalled at the rise of faculty protest organizations. Since most faculty are fair-minded, respectful, and contented, it is assumed, other explanations must be given. A few trouble-makers are rocking the boat. Some long-haired men and short-haired women are creating false impressions of revolt. A "certain small, but bitter, group of the faculty have for too long hampered the operation of the college."[12] The dissatisfied, vocal few claim to speak for the satisfied majority. Aspiring administrators

---

11. Dale Tillery, "Academic Rank: Promise or Peril?" Junior College Journal, February 1963, p. 8.

12. Accreditation Letter in author's files.

credential in hand but with no chance for appointment, are vengefully sitrring up trouble.

Administrators disagree with the faculty's contention for sweeping participation. Several community groups--administrators, students, faculty, trustees, citizens, have a right to participate. Often faculty suffer from the halo effect; they assume expertise in one field engenders expertise in another. But does Willie Mays know the relative merits of Gillette blades over Brand "X"? Does a Ph.D. in history qualify a man to be a good administrator? Administrators doubt it. The vast bulk of faculty has little knowledge of the budget, for example. Few know of the recent insights into administration and management flowing from behavioral analyzes or organizations. Good intent does not run a college.

Loss of Identity

Lombardi suggests another reason for faculty anxiety.[13] As colleges grow in size, insecurity due to a loss of identity can develop. The once-ubiquitous president is now only rarely seen. The old Dean of Instruction, a coffee-companion, now has a new title and three layers of subordinates barricading him from the faculty. The problems of the "Organization Man" develop. The faculty member becomes anxious, uncertain as to his status and niche, unclear as to what he stands for, not knowing whether he is human or cog. In an effort to maintain his identity, a faculty member may join groups, raise cain, and pound tables. He may advocate formal institutions, such as the Academic Senate, to influence policy, as he once influenced it during coffee breaks.

13. John Lombardi, "Faculty in the Administrative Process," Junior College Journal, November 1966, p. 10.

Faculty Conservatism

The "academic veto group"[14] creates much anxiety in administrators. Faculties are notorious for their resistance to innovation. Corson writes "the departmental structure can serve, and often does, as a bastion of the status quo in opposition to any creative educational leadership....The tendency of faculty's resistance to change usually means that the impetus for innovation comes from a dean or the president."[15] Thus if faculty participation increases and administration power decreases, administrators rightfully fear that a deadening conservatism will result. Significant innovations--team teaching, TV teaching, programmed learning, systems approaches, etc.--will be almost impossible to implement. In the junior college, conservatism could in fact become reaction, for those that most ardently espouse faculty participation and self-governance tend to be most reactionary on the comprehensive, "open-door" junior college. They would rise entrance requirements before the "open-door". They would eliminate "non-academic" courses. They would endeavor to create a charged atmosphere of intellectual stimulation. Administrators fear that the "open-door," "college of democracy," may be transformed into a narrow liberal arts college for the academic elite if faculties assume control. "Forward," cry the standard-bearers of administration prerogative, "on behalf of democracy and equal opportunity."

"Universal" versus "Particular" Orientation

Viewing reality from different perspectives affects the per-

---

14. See David Riesman, Constraint and Variety in American Education, (Doubleday: Garden City, N. Y.) 1956, Chapter 11. Riesman coined this phrase and provided many ideas in this section.

15. Corson, Governance, pp. 93, 109.

ception of that reality. The six blind men each developed a concept of "elephant" from his own experience, and the six probably debated long into the night over the nature of the elephant. To an eagle, the hills below appear to be mild mounds. To the creeping snail, the hills are as insurmountable as Everest.

Likewise, faculty and administration have differing orientations to the college. The administrator sees problems relating to the institution as a whole--the "universal." Money is scarce and must be allocated. What is best for the institution as a whole? The biology depart.ent wants an electron microscope, the band wants new uniforms, the business department wants modern computers, the library wants more staff. What priorities exist? Who gets what? and how much? "The claims of general education, science, engineering, social science, humanities are all ardently espoused. Adjustment, accomodation, and compromise among these claims must often be achieved primarily by the administrator."[16] Administrators evaluate problems, then, from the viewpoint of the totality--what is good for the group?[17] Burton Clark lists some of the concerns of administrators: order, efficient use of resources, maintaining a sense of direction, coping with external pressures.[18]

Faculty, quite naturally, have a different viewpoint--the "particular." Faculty asks not "what is good for the group?" but "what is good for my department and for me?" Administrators are institution-oriented, faculty are committed to a discipline.

---

16. Richard H. Sullivan, "Administrative-Faculty Relationships in College and University." Journal of Higher Education, June, 1956, p. 325.

17. Robert Tannenbaum, Irving R. Weschler, Fred Massarik, Leadership and Organization, (McGraw-Hill: New York) 1961, p. 69-76.

18. Burton Clark, "Faculty Authority," AAUP Bulletin, December 1961, p. 296.

"We in biology needed that electron microscope. Why didn't we get it? Simpleton bought band uniforms; of all the useless things! My God, what a dolt we have for a president!" Clark lists some of the concerns of faculty: self-government, academic freedom, a strong department.[19] Much conflict, therefore, may be attributed to this dissimilarity of interest and orientation.

Poor Administration

Greater concensus among authorities of administration and management is emerging over the role of subordinates in policy-making.[20] These authorities advocate two principles: first, that the classical theory of administration, in which authority and responsibility rested in the president and was delegated downward, is fallacious; second, that subordinate participation tend to increase output. Harold Dobbs, articulating these ideas, says, "without doubt, institutional changes achieved today without faculty acceptance will be evanescent....No matter how good a majority vote in favor of his proposal may seem to the president, if those who voted 'aye' aren't soundly convinced of its merits, or at least ready to experiment, it will not march."[21] Later he writes, "since faculty see themselves as self-employed professionals rather than as employees, enthusiasm in a common enterprise is proportionate to the sense of ownership they have in it by virtue of sharing in the decisions that govern its course."[22] Rensis Likert says simply,

---

19. Ibid.

20. Campbell, Etzioni, Griffiths, Leavitt, Likert, McGregor, Selznick. See NSSE 1964 Yearbook.

21. Dobbs, The Academic President, p. 44.

22. Ibid. p. 96.

the "feeling that if a manager permits subordinates to exercise influence on what goes on in his department, he has lessened his influence, is disproved by research."[23]

With these findings as a criteria for good and not so good administration, it may be said that one possible cause of faculty-administration conflict is poor administration.[24] Poor administrators are defensive and insecure in their position. They refuse to delegate, to let others (either subordinates or faculty) make decisions. They see the faculty as a threat to a coveted position. They believe that administrators must make every decision, that is is a sign of weakness to say "I don't know" or "Figure it out yourself." They feel they must win <u>every</u> battle and must be right about everything, or lose face. Many of these poor administrators get bogged down in details; they are so busy, busy--yet they make little impact on things. Many have quit reading, losing the excitement of scholarly inquiry and intellectual excitement as well as losing a source of common ground with faculty--Lombardi has said that it is difficult to lead a group of scholars if one is not scholarly himself. Many administrators overlook the talents of the faculty, often insulting their intelligence--e.g. only one text per course although ten unique men teach it.

Many other practices may be considered poor administration, but only two in particular will be examined here, inconsistency and impersonality. Inconsistency is another characteristic of poor administration. When the last person to see the administrator is the only one who knows the policy, much ill will results. Consistency is the more difficult path to tread, but in the long run, it

---

23. New Patterns of Management, (McGraw-Hill: New York) 1961, p. 179.

24. Much of this material was obtained from interviews with two administrators.

reduces misunderstanding. Another poor administration practice that engenders ill feeling involves "backstairs alliances" and "kitchen cabinets." The administrator cannot be a "chum", for this impairs objective decisions, creates dissentionion within the faculty, and raises barriers between faculty and administration. "It is necessary that an administrator who wishes to maintain good judgment acquire as impersonal a manner as possible....It is very difficult to hurt a friend--a duty not one cares to do."[25]

Lack of Data

The manufacturer seeks to fathom consumer demands and tastes, to evaluate consumer satisfaction, and to discover ways to improve his product. A considerable portion of his budget goes into market research. Yet education gives only lip service to its equivalent of market research, "institutional research." This is education's tool for analyzing "consumer demands," evaluating its "product," and improving "production techniques." Many decision must be made on questions like: "what courses should be offered?" "How are the graduates faring?" "Should educational TV be developed?" But, too often intuition rather than facts guide debate. There exists a "lack of operational and administrative research that would provide the factual data which would make for more objective, as well as more thorough consideration."[26]

Too often faculty and administration tackle an issue without enough data. Instead of dealing with issues, personality clashes develop. Not enough information exists to keep discussion on the track. Emotions flame, partly out of natural differences, but partly out of ignorance.[27] Decisions, to these not involved,

---

25. Stuart E. Marsee, "The Unfinished Business of Administration, UCLA Administration Laboratory, February 1964, p. 2.

26. Corson, Governance, p. 116. See also Sullivan, p. 319.

27. See Figure 1.

appear arbitrary, and often are. Information, to be sure, is no panacea, but it helps.

Goals and Objectives

Considerable conflict occurs over the whole problem of college goals. Faculty and administration may have differing goals in mind. Or the goals are not sharply in focus.

Priest, for example, reports that faculty and "the people" see two divergent purposes for the college.[28] Faculty see it as a tool for social change, and, hence, it should be guided by them, the educated elite. The "people," expressing themselves through their elected representatives on the board, conceive of the college as a tool of heritage-transmission, a conserving influence. The president, as executive officer of the board and as titular head of the faculty, is caught in the cross-fire. Conflict results.

As the junior college evolves out of secondary education status into higher education status, another type of conflict develops. Examined above was the question of faculty demands for participation in policy-making, one conflict area resulting from the change. Another conflict area concerns the junior college curriculum. Liberal arts faculty, particularly, question the terminal function of the junior college, which, in their eyes, dilutes their status and weakens their claim for acceptance by other branches of higher education. Philosophically, they feel that a sound liberal arts education is essential for life and for leisure. General education is a weak palliative. Vocational courses should be taught elsewhere. Remedial classes should remain at the high school level. College is a college, not a catch-all. Needless to say, most administrators strongly disagree, holding to the "open-door" concept.

---

28. Priest, "Faculty-Administration Relationships," p. 6.

Communication

Many of the problem areas examined above could be subsumed under the catagory of communication. Inadequate information and misunderstanding reinforce stereotypes. Ambiguous goals result from lack of communication. Policies out of the clear blue sky are likely to be resisted. But communication is such a problem in itself that it warrants separate consideration.

Much confusion exists as to what should be communicated. Even administrators most ardent for faculty participation have trouble with this problem. Should the cost of a new furnace be communicated? Should letters from irate parents complaining about a teacher be communicated? Should possible lawsuits against the district?

Too often communication is informal and piecemeal. The king puts on peasant garb and goes into the marketplace to learn the people's sentiments. Too often communication within the college occurs in similar fashion. This may be more appropriate in a small college, when a general faculty meeting occurs every coffee break, but as a school grows in size, more formal procedures must be developed. First, written procedures and policies must be created. Second, grieveance procedures must be contructed. The absence of either one creates friction. Faculty (and administration) are adrift. Areas of responsibility are vague. The illusion of favoritism can easily emerge: "John got the school car for his conference, but I didn't." When dissatisfaction occurs, faculty can demand restitution through formal processes. Without grievance procedures, frustration will be channeled along less constructive lines, perception is colored, and conflict ensues.

Semantic difficulties compàicate communication. Both the United States and Russia claim to practice "democracy." Both the

U S. and North Vietnam claim to be warring for "self-determination" and against "foreign agression." Likewise faculty and administration have different connotations for the same words. Take the overused word "professional," for example. To faculty, policy development without faculty consultation is unprofessional. To administrators, criticism is unprofessional. "Faculty participation" means many things. Everybody is for it. Yet James W. Tunnell "found significant disagreement between faculty members and administrators regarding the extent and process of faculty involvement in policy formulation. Junior college administrators viewed the faculty as more involved in policy formulation that did the faculty members themselves."[29] To faculty, therefore, "faculty participation" tends to mean "self-governance," but to administrators who resist the impulse toward "collegiality." For administrators, "conservative" describes faculty who resist instructional innovation. "Academic freedom" has come to mean "ruthless" grading and opposition to the "open-door" by faculty in the minds of administrators; for faculty, however, it connotes the ability to set standards, to establish curriculum, and to inquire after truth without interference. Much conflict between faculty and administration results from misunderstanding of common words. Semantics creates many barriers to communication.

---

29. Ibid.

Role Expectations

What is a president? What should he do? Not do? Is he a promoter or a scholar? a budget-maker or an educational leader? conserver or innovator? faculty leader or board representative? defender or academic freedom or plant developer? To be sure, he is all of these and more. But little consensus exists among groups as to the primacy of one function or another. Little consensus exists whether the president should play this role or that.

Faculty have certain role expectations for presidents.[30] He should raise salaries, improve facilities, attract excellent students, exercise mild leadership as an impartial referee between factions, protect faculty rights and freedom, and keep the books. Boards have different expectations. The president should maintain efficiency and trim unnecessary costs, build powerful football teams, project a favorable image of the college throughout the community, and squelch radicalism within the faculty. Presidents have other expectations: raise funds, select strong faculty, allocate resources, improve weak departments, strengthen public relations, develop physical facilities, lead innovation, etc. These differing expectations, of course, create conflict. Faculties resist some instructional innovation, claiming that the president has no prerogative in this realm. Boards resist requests for "esoteric" courses of no earthly use to anybody but kooks, for "superfluous" library facilities, and for "unreasonable" salaries. Presidents try to mediate between academic freedom and external opposition. When one group, be it administration or faculty, fails to live up to the expectations of another group, dissatisfaction and conflict result.

---

30. Much of this section is derived from Sullivan, p. 312.

The Dynamics of Conflict

James Coleman submits a concept, the "dynamics of conflict," that may aid in understanding conflict.[31] He states that conflict passes through several stages, undergoing tremendous change in the process. This change has several dimensions:

1) Specific to general: a specific issue becomes a general attack.

2) New to different issues: issues other than the one that precipitates conflict are brought in.

3) Disagreement to antagonism: issue-disagreement progresses to personal antagonism.

4) Truth to victory: the goal of understanding reality shifts to one of defeating an opponent.

The "involuntary processes" of conflict are illustrated in the following chart:

1. Initial single issue
2. Disrupts equilibrium of relations
3. Allows previously suppressed issues against opponent to appear
4. More and more of the opponent's beliefs enter into the disagreement.
5. The opponent appears totally bad.
6. Charges against the opponent as a person
7. Dispute becomes independent of the initial disagreement.

The following example may illuminate Coleman's theory of conflict with its "involuntary processes." The college president announces that the college will establish a computerized registration system next fall (1). The faculty, caught unprepared (2). reacts by

---

31. James Coleman, Community Conflict, (Free Press: Glencoe, Ill.) 1957. As taken from Barton Herrscher, "Conflict Theory and Junior College Administration," Paper for UCLA Education 249, June, 1966.

labeling the decision a fiat from on high (3). Faculty politicians recall previous decisions made without faculty participation, implying that the president has an antiquated concept of the junior college and of administration (4). He is authoritarian (5). He is a despot, motivated from severe feelings of sexual inadequach, compensating by exercising supreme power; he also hated his father (6). The president is a rat (7). A similar sequence, in equally unfavorable terms, could be presented describing the president's perception of the conflict and his opponenets.

The Nature of "Differences"

Schmidt and Tannenbaum, in examining the management of differences, have constructed a conceptual framework that illustrates and integrates many of the elements of conflict.[32] This framework synthesizes many of the ideas examined in the main body of this paper. Perception, role, information, and goals are some of the ideas presented in the framework. This framework complements Coleman's concept. More important, it enhances understanding of faculty-administration conflict. The framework is schematically presented in figure one and two. Assume a disagreement has developed over whether a college should initiate a systems approach to instruction. The administrator favors the change. The faculty member opposes it. Some of the bases of disagreement and possible reasons for this disagreement are represented in figure one and two.

Concluding Statement

Several factors contributing to faculty-administration conflict have been examined: stereotyping, differing goals, differing role expectations, lack of data, separate perspectives, communication,

---

32. Warren H. Schmidt and Robert Tannenbaum, "Management of Differences," Harvard Business Review, Nov.-Dec. 1960, pp. 107-115.

Figure 1.

NATURE OF THE DIFFERENCE

	Over Facts	Over Methods	Over Goals	Over Values
Faculty Member	"This plan will sterilize the learning process by automating a human experience."	"We should study the proposal further and observe the experience of others."	"Education should teach human values as well as knowledge and data."	"We must not become a Berkeley, a depersonalized factory."
Administrator	"This plan will enhance the learning process by clarifying our goals and individualizing the experience."	"We should implement the proposal in several departments as a pilot study."	"Education cannot occur without concrete data to build upon."	"We must keep abreast of the latest innovations."

Figure 2.

REASONS FOR THE DIFFERENCE

	Explanation of the position of the faculty member	Explanation of the Position of the Administration
Informational (Exposure to different information.)	He has read articles describing the de-humanization of education. He hears arguments on the cost-savings of the systems-approval.	He has attended conferences and read articles praising the results of systems-approval without loss of human relations. He reads studies comparing results of new versus traditional learning experience.
Perceptual (Different interpretation of the same data because of differing backgrounds, experience, and so forth.)	He prides himself and the junior college on its "teaching function." He recalls the Berkeley Revolt with sympathy for the students. He distructs "efficiency" of cost-reduction at human expense. "Efficiency" connotes to him smaller salaries, authoritarian bounds and presidents, and meek faculties.	He prides himself on being innovative and sees faculty as being conservative. He admires the values and results of the systems-approach. He recalls faculty resistance to previous attempts to innovate. He sees the faculty as overly defensive.
Role (Pressure to take a certain stand because of status or position.)	He believes that colleagues, students, and society looks to him to defend humanistic values and academic freedom.	He believes colleagues, students, and society looks to him to defend worthwhile innovation and progress.

poor administration, are only some of them. An effort to synthesize these factors by presenting two concepts, "the dynamics of conflict" and "the nature of 'differences'," has been attempted.

Before exaiming the topic of faculty-administration conflict, I hypothesized that an understanding of the conflict would lead to insights into means of eliminating it. After examining this topic, however, I am less optimistic. Instead, in my opinion, two types of conflict exist, natural and aggravated. Some conflict exists in the nature of things: the faculty does have a perspective different than the administration; the faculty does have different goals, values, and experiences than administrators; people do depend on stereotypes to structure their environment. Thus, some conflict is natural and will persist in some form or another. The second type, though, is aggravated conflict, which is neither natural nor necessary. Poor administrative practices, lack of data, ambiguous goals, and faulty communication tend to compound conflict, to aggravate it. Thus, the most adept administrators and the most fair-minded faculty cannot avoud some conflict--natural conflict. They can, however, reduce aggravated conflict.

Because colleges are becoming larger, because the junior college will continue striving for higher education status, because more teachers are being recruited from university backgrounds, because teachers are becoming more assertive, because the trend toward collective bargaining is accelerating, conflict will continue. Never-the-less, insight into the etiology of conflict will help to prevent aggravated conflict and to modulate natural conflict. As long as men are organized into enterprizes, conflict will occur. Knowledge of its nature can perhaps help men to make the most of it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

I. Books

Blocker, Clyde E., Robert H. Plummer, and Richard C. Richardson, Jr. The Two-Year College: A social synthesis. (Prentice-Hall, Inc.: Englewood Cliffs, N. J.) 1965.

Coleman, James. Community Conflict. (The Free Press: Glencoe, Ill.) 1957

Corson, John J. Governance of Colleges and Universities. (McGraw-Hill: N. Y.) 1960.

Dobbs, Harold W. The Academic President--Educator or Caretaker? (McGraw-Hill: N.Y.) 1962.

Leavitt, Harold J. Managerial Psychology. (University of Chicago Press: Chicago) 2nd Ed. 1964.

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. (McGraw-Hill: N.Y.) 1961.

National Society for the Study of Education. Behavioral Science and Educational Administration. (University of Chicago Press: Chicago) 63rd Yearbook, Part II. 1964.

Riesman, David. Constraint and Variety in American Education. (Doubleday: Garden City, N.Y.) 1956.

Simon, Herbert A. Aiministrative Behavior. (The Free Press: Glencoe, Ill.) 2nd Ed. 1957

Tannenbaum, Robert, Irving R. Wescheler, and Fred Massarik. Leadership and Organization. (McGraw-Hill: N.Y.) 1961.

II. Periodicals

California Teachers Association. "Faculty-Administration Relations in California Higher Education." CTA Commission on Higher Education: Policy statement adopted by the State Council of Education, April 8, 1961.

Clark, Burton R. "Faculty Authority," AAUP Bulletin. Winter 1961.

Elly, Lynn. "The University of California: Faculty Participation in the Government of the University," AAUP Bulletin. March 1964.

Herrscher, Barton. "Conflict Theory and Junior College Administration." Paper submitted for Education 249, UCLA, January 1, 1966.

Howe, Ray A. "Faculty-Administration Relationship In Extremis," Junior College Journal. November 1966.

Lombardi, John. "Faculty in the Administrative Process," Junior College Journal. November 1966.

London, Jack. "Barriers to the Development of Effective Personnel Practice in Public School Organization." Educational Administration and Supervision. February, 1957.

Marsee, Stuart. "The Unfinished Business of Administration," UCLA Administration Laboratory. March 1964.

Priest, Bill J. "Faculty-Administration Relationships." Junior College Journal. March 1964.

Riesman, David. "Innovation and Reaction in Higher Education." Journal of General Education. Oct. 1964.

Schmidt, Warren, and Robert Tannenbaum. "Management of Differences," Harvard Business Review. Nov-Dec 1960.

Sharma, William. "Who Should Make What Decisions," Administrator's Notebook. April 1955.

Sullivan, Richard H. "Administrative-Faculty Relationships in Colleges and Universities," Journal of Higher Education. January 1956.

Tillery, Dale. "Academic Rank: Promise or Peril?" Junior College Journal. February 1963.

Wilson, Logan. "Academic Administration: Its Abuses and Uses," AAUP Bulletin. Winter 1955.

III. Interviews

College President

College President

President of AFT Local

Academic Senate President

President of CJCFA Chapter

Division Dean

Department Chairman